

Application No. 10/811,977
Amendment "A" dated October 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed April 19, 2004

REMARKS

Specification

The Office Action of April 19, 2004 objected to the abstract as exceed 150 words. As amended in the Amendments to the Specification, the abstract of the disclosure has been amended such that it does not exceed 150 words. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

The Office Action of April 19, 2004 rejected claims 1-33 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,398 to Parthasarathy. By this paper, claims 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-18, 31 and 32 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 15, 19-30 and 33 are pending.

By this paper, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

receiving a data file from a first other computer associated with the network . . .

receiving an update table from the first other computer that specifies a second other computer associated with the network from which the required version of the required software component is to be received; [and]

requesting and receiving the required version of the required software component from the second other computer; . . .

Thus, according to claim 1, the required version of the required software component is received from a second computer in the network that is different from the first computer in the network from which the initial data file and the update table are received. This aspect of the invention of claim 1 provides certain benefits not understood in the prior art. For example, the data file, which includes content data and information specifying the required software components that are to be used to process the content does not need to be the computer from which the required software components are received. Instead, according to the invention of claim 1, the data file, with the content, can be located at a first computer in the network, while the software components can be located in a second computer in the network.

Parthasarathy, in contrast, discloses a system in which the content and any required software components are both received from the same remote computer. Specifically, Parthasarathy describes the HTML document being stored "on a remote computer 44", which is browsed "from the local computer 34." (Col. 11, lines 21-25). In addition, Parthasarathy states

Application No. 10/811,977
Amendment "A" dated October 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed April 19, 2004

that "the desired software component is obtained from the remote computer." Thus, according to Parthasarathy, both the HTML document and the required software are obtained from the same remote computer. In contrast, claim 1 specifies that the content data and the required version of the required software component are received from different computers, which provides significant flexibility and benefits that were not understood by Parthasarathy.

Because Parthasarathy fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable. The other independent claims have also been amended to specify that the content data and the required version of the required software components are received from different computers and likewise distinguish from the prior art. The other claims are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reason.

Applicant respectfully notes that the above discussion should not be construed to constitute an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between the claims of the present application and the references cited by the Examiner. Instead, such distinctions are presented solely by way of example. Applicant notes further that the arguments presented herein have been made merely to clarify the claimed invention from elements purported by the Examiner to be disclosed by the cited prior art references. Such arguments should not, however, be construed as an acquiescence on the part of the Applicant as to the purported teachings or prior art status of any of the cited references, nor as to the characterization of the cited references advanced by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the purported teaching and prior art status of any and all of the cited references at any appropriate time.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 15, 19-30, and 33 are in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues that could be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 19th day of October, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



CARL T. REED

Registration No. 45,454

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

RBI:blh

W:\15404\1\BLM0000003218V001.DOC